



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,901	12/14/2001	Mandayam Andampillai Sridhar	AMPSP006	7678
32986	7590	11/02/2004		EXAMINER
IPSG, P.C. P.O. BOX 700640 SAN JOSE, CA 95170-0640				STORK, KYLE R
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2178	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/017,901	SRIDHAR, MANDAYAM ANDAMPILLAI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application filed 14 December 2001.
2. Claims 1-6 are pending. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said data source" and "said second template expander" in line 2 and lines 2-3 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

The term "substantially simultaneously" in claim 6 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially simultaneously" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0 (16 November 1999) in further view of Ensink et al. (XML based Adaptation of the Composite Approach for Database Integration).

As per independent claim 1, XSL discloses a computer implemented method for creating a plurality of web pages, comprising:

- Providing a meta-template having therein at least one of a tag and a variable (page 6, paragraph 4)
- Providing a first user data model (page 6, paragraph 5- page 7, continuation of paragraph)
- Expanding said meta-template against said first user data model using a first template expander, thereby obtaining a first template (page 6, paragraph 5- page 7, continuation of paragraph; page 92, section 16.1: Here, the combination of the meta-template (style sheet) and the first user data model (source elements) create a resulting tree in as an well structured XML file. XML files may server as templates for further document processing (Ensink: page 4, column 2, first full paragraph))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined XSL's method of creating templates that are

XML files with Ensink's assertion that XML files can server as templates, since it would have allowed the user to utilize built in functions of the XML language.

As per dependent claim 4, XSL discloses the limitation similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. XSL further discloses providing a second user data model different from the first user data model and expanding the meta template against the second user data model using the first template expander, thereby obtaining a second template (page 6, paragraph 5- page 7; page 6, paragraph 5- page 7, continuation of paragraph; page 92, section 16.1: Here, a data model (source element) is not restricted exclusively to one data model. The reference discloses the method of processing any data model compliant with the standards of the language. It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art to use a second data model in order to obtain a second template. Furthermore, XML files may server as templates for further document processing (Ensink et al. (XML based Adaptation of the Composite Approach for Database Integration: page 4, column 2, first full paragraph))).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined XSL's method of creating templates that are XML files with Ensink's assertion that XML files can server as templates, since it would have allowed the user to utilize built in functions of the XML language that allow a user to create more than one template by using more than one data model.

7. Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0 in further view of Ensink et al. (XML based Adaptation of the Composite Approach for Database Integration).

As per dependent claim 2, XSL discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. XSL fails to disclose:

- Providing a data source
- Expanding the first template against the data source using a second template expander, thereby obtaining first codes implementing a first web page

However, Ensink discloses:

- Providing a data source (page 4, second full paragraph: Here, the database is the data source)
- Expanding the first template against the data source using a second template expander, thereby obtaining first codes implementing a first web page (page 4, first and second full paragraphs: Here, the first template is expanded against the data source creating a web page)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined XSL's method of generating a template with Ensink's method of filling in a template with data, since it would have allowed a user to associate several different data sets with a template to receive dynamic pages based upon the data.

As per dependent claim 5, XSL discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. XSL fails to disclose the method further comprising expanding the second template against the data source using the second template expander, thereby obtaining second codes implementing a second web page. Ensink discloses the method further comprising expanding the second

template against the data source using the second template expander, thereby obtaining second codes implementing a second web page (page 3, first paragraph below XML Code; page 4, first and second full paragraphs: Here, a template is expanded against the data source creating a web page. This allows for any number of templates to be used against a data set in order to obtain information desired by a user).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined XSL's method for generating any number of templates with Ensink's method of generating a web page from a data source and template, since it would have allowed a user to apply any number of templates to a data source to obtain the information from the data source that he/she desired.

8. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0 and Ensink et al. in further view of Morrison (XML Unleashed, 1999).

As per dependent claim 1, XSL and Ensink disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. XSL and Ensink fail to specifically disclose the method in which the first template expander and the second template expander are the same. Morrison discloses the method in which the first template expander and the second template expander are the same (Chapter 10, page 1: Here, because both the XSL and XML documents use an XML parser in order to be parsed (expanded), the first expander and the second expander are the same).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined XSL and Ensink's method of generating web pages from templates with Morrison's method of using the same expander to generate templates and web pages, since the XML language has the built in ability for XSL and XML to be parsed (expanded) with the same parser.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over XSL Transformations (XSLT) Version 1.0 and Ensink et al. in further view of The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition (from: Dictionary.com).

As per dependent claim 6, XSL, and Ensink disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 5, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. They fail to disclose the method wherein expanding the meta-template against the first user data model and expanding the meta-template against the second user data model occurs substantially simultaneously. However, The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language discloses the method wherein expanding the meta-template against the first user data model and expanding the meta-template against the second user data model occurs substantially simultaneously (parallel processing, page 1, first definition).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined XSL and Ensink method for creating templates with The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language's method of processing substantially simultaneously, since it would have allowed the user to perform two independent tasks at the same time, thereby saving the user time for processing both tasks since the processing would be sped up.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US006799299B1 Li et al.: Discloses creating style sheets in a data processing system.
- US006779153B1 Kagle: Discloses creation of web pages.
- US006735741B1 Pannu: Discloses dynamic resource linking for copies at different storage locations.
- US006668354B1 Chen et al.: Discloses automatic display script and style sheet generation.
- US006651218B1 Adler et al.: Discloses dynamic content database for multiple document genres.
- US006338076B1 Hidding et al.: Discloses preparing a document involving finishing instructions.
- US006308188B1 Bernardo et al.: Discloses building a web site with automatic work flow.
- US006088711A Fein et al.: Discloses defining and applying style to a paragraph.
- US005903905A Andersen et al.: Discloses simultaneously constructing and displaying a dynamic preview of a document.
- US005778402A Gipson: Discloses automatic formatting of a document using rules.

- US005228121A Fontaine et al: Discloses document generation.
- US006718515B1 Connor et al.: Discloses populating dynamic fields with data objects.
- US006684369B1 Bernardo et al.: Discloses web site creation with templates.
- US005983227A Nazem et al.: Discloses a dynamic page generator.
- US005940834A Pinard et al.: Discloses an automatic web page generator.
- US 2001/0011287 Goto et al.: Discloses defining a style specification for structured documents.
- US 4704703 Fenwick: Discloses dynamic processing system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178



JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER